



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,613	08/09/2001	Attila Szepesvary	021756-070700US	2976
51206 7590 04/26/2010 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP/ORACLE TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER RUTTEN, JAMES D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/26/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/925,613	Applicant(s) SZEPEVARY ET AL.	
	Examiner JAMES RUTTEN	Art Unit 2192	

All Participants:

(1) JAMES RUTTEN

(2) Scott Adams, Reg. No. 63,302

Date of Interview: 6 April 2010

Status of Application: Notice of Allowance

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 4:15

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
n/a

Claims discussed:
21, 23, 24

Prior art documents discussed:
n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner Rutten phoned Mr. Adams to indicate that previously presented claim 21 (currently renumbered claim 15) is dependent upon a canceled claim, and should likely depend from previously presented claim 19 (currently renumbered claim 14). Mr. Adams agreed to the amendment. Further amendments were discussed regarding clarification of several claims. Mr. Adams suggested submitting the amendments as a rule 312 amendment. Mr. Rutten agreed that the amendments should not affect the scope of the invention, and so would await Mr. Adams submission.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/J. Derek Rutten/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2192

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)